

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,036	ZHU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Amended RCE

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Attorney Jean K. Testa Reg. No. 39,396.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 30 August 2005

**Time:** 2:00pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*All pending claims, and the fact that claim 26 is pending not a withdrawn claim.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*The prior art applied in the last office action, and how all the features argued in the June 17<sup>th</sup> 2005 amendment are met by the prior art of record.*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative in order to clarify applicant's arguments from the June 17<sup>th</sup> 2005 response, because each of applicant's argued features was clearly and directly taught by the prior art of record. In the course of the interview it was determined that the novelty of applicant's application, was a limitation which was missing from the pending claims, but fully disclosed in applicant's original disclosure. The applicant's representative agreed to allow the examiner to make an examiner amendment to the pending independent claims to clarify the feature of extracting a central portion from each sub-image and using only the extracted central portion to construct the extended volume image of the invention, which in contrast to the prior art of record, does not utilize any of the acquired edge data for reconstruction of the extended composite image.